Parent ROC
²⁴¹ Am
⁶⁰ Co
¹³⁷ Cs
¹⁵² Eu
¹⁵⁴ Eu
³ H
²³⁹ Pu
²²⁶ Ra
⁹⁰ Sr
²³² Th
²³⁵ U

Assumptions:
RESRAD BLD
entire floor, 4 walls and ceiling are sources
no removable/no dusts
no ingestion or inhalation pathways
time zero is max dose
receptor center of concrete room

Summary:

With the exception of SR/Y-90, when modeled the same (RESRAD adjusted to match EPA models) for external exposur Notes:

With the exception of Sr/Y-90 all total calculations are within an order of magnitude in difference.

With the exception of Sr/Y-90, Eu-152, Eu-154, and Co-60 Dose all total calculations are roughly within a factor of 3 or less For Co-60 BDCC and BPRG appear to differ in comparison to each other when compared to RESRAD BLD results.

The DCF differences are not the only differences in modeled doses.

While the DCF differences predict total dose differences fairly well for most nuclides there are a few which the expected

5		Input Conversions		
Contributing Progeny	Input Concentration (dpm/m²)	pCi/m2	pCi/cm2	
	10,000	4504.5	0.45045	
	500,000	225225	22.5225	
^{137m} Ba	500,000	225225	22.5225	
R0000000000000000000000000000000000000	500,000	225225	22.5225	
	500,000	225225	22.5225	
	500,000	225225	22.5225	
^{235m} U	10,000	4504.5	0.45045	
²²² Rn+D	10,000	4504.5	0.45045	
²¹⁰ Pb+D	10,000	4504.5	0.45045	
²¹⁰ Po+D	10,000	4504.5	0.45045	
90 _Y	100,000	4504.5	4.505	
ı	3,650	1644	0.164	
²²⁸ Ra+D	3,650	1644	0.164	
²²⁸ Th+D	3,650	1644	0.164	
²³¹ Th	48,800	21982	2.198	

Totals

es the EPA and ANL models are within an order of magnitude difference.

s difference.

differences are significantly different.

Adult Worke	er			
RESRAD BLD Risk	RESRAD BLD Dose mrem	BPRG 3D Risk	BDCC Dose mrem	risk BPRG/RE SRAD
3.62E-08	5.74E-02	4.04E-08	5.63E-02	1.12E+00
3.68E-05	4.81E+01	1.08E-04	4.55E+02	2.93E+00
2.22E-05	2.91E+01	4.34E-05	55	1.95E+00
3.33E-05	44.1	2.56E-04	3.18E+02	7.69E+00
2.80E-05	36.9	2.17E-04	270	7.75E+00
NA	NA	NA	NA	
6.34E-07	0.874	1.40E-06	1.78	2.21E+00
3.50E-06	2.82	3.57E-06	4.65	1.02E+00
4.77E-08	5.99E-02	4.09E-11	1.26E-05	8.57E-04
1.27E-05	5.75	3.97E-06		3.13E-01
3.09E-06	4.26	6.83E-06	8.7	2.21E+00
	1.40E-04 1.72E+02	6.40E-04	1.12E+03	

BPRG/DCC

3D model (entire floor, entire walls, and ceiling are sources)

no removable/no dusts

no ingestion or inhalation pathways

BDCC = mrem/yr thus X 25 for 25 years exposure

receptor center of concrete room

BDCC/RE SRAD	MISC	Slope factor difference BPRG/RESRA DBLD	DCF difference BDCC/RESR ADBLD	Daughters BDCC/RESRAD
	Excellent agreement;	Waiting		
	note: avg location =	for answer		
9.80E-01	greater risk and dose	from	7.94E-01	
	insignificant difference	Charley Yu		
	but note BDCC and BPRG	on how		
9.46E+00	sig different %	RESRADBL	9.80E-01	
1.89E+00	insignificant difference	D converts	1.10E+01	9.87E-01
	Somewhat significant	mass to		
7.20E+00	differences	area	9.89E-01	
	Somewhat significant	source for		
7.32E+00	differences	Heast. For	9.86E-01	
		Dose it		
2.04E+00	Insignificant difference	defaults to	8.35E-01	1.01E+00
1.65E+00	Excellent agreement, note avg location is less risk but more dose?	the FGR 12 groundpla ne DCF. Assume same done	1.03E+00	included +D
		for risk but need to		
	Significant differences	verify.	5.79E+00	
6.00E-01	Insignificant difference	,	9.44E-01	included +D
2.04E+00	Insignificant difference		1.01E+00	8.24E-01

This suggest another assumption or factor drives differences or potential error in formulas? Reviewing 1st answer from Charley Yu to complete analysis. Have second question regarding risk.





